

REMARKS

In the previously filed response dated August 4, 2008 to the Office Action dated May 2, 2008, applicant presented arguments traversing the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 11-18, 21-24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's prior art disclosure in Fig. 3 ("APD") in view of Winer (US 5,796,401), Okazaki (US 7,079,177), and Kelman (US 6,850,896).

This supplemental response is being filed to further advance prosecution of the application by presenting independent claims 1, 13 and 24 in amended form to further patentably distinguish from the prior art of record.

The arguments presented in the August 4 response to the May 2 Office Action are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of his application in light of the arguments presented in the August 4 response, the amendments to independent claims 1, 13 and 24 submitted herewith, and the following discussion.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to define with more specificity the function of the means for "attaching" and "recognizing" (i.e., the means-plus-function recitation between the drag-and-drop means and the group editing means). More specifically, amended independent claim 1 recites:

means for inserting a dropped item in a desired position within the image displaying area if an item from the item displaying area does not already exist in the same dropped position and, if an item already exists in the same dropped position, for attaching the dropped item onto an end of the existing item and recognizing both the dropped item and the existing item as information belonging to the same group;

Thus, amended independent claim 1 specifically requires the function of inserting a dropped item in a desired position within the image displaying area if an item from the item displaying area does not already exist in the same dropped position. This function of the user interface recited in amended independent claim 1 is fully supported by the disclosure as originally filed and, therefore, no new matter has been entered. For example, the foregoing function recited in amended independent claim 1 corresponds to Step 5 of the operation of the user interface which is described on page 8, lines 4-6 of the specification and shown in Fig. 2 as originally filed.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the specific means-plus-function recitation directed to the means for "inserting" and "attaching" and corresponding conditions recited in amended independent claim 1.

For example, in the May 2, 2008 Office Action, Okazaki was cited for its disclosure of a group editing function using drag-and-drop. In this regard, Okazaki's group editing function is accomplished by means for moving an item belonging to a certain group to another group using drag-and-drop. Such item in Okazaki has an attribute showing the group to which such item belongs, and Okazaki discloses means for renewing the attribute, that is, changing a belonging group to another. Accordingly, Okazaki does not teach any means "for inserting a dropped item in a desired position within the image displaying area if an item from the item displaying area does not already exist in the same dropped position", and further in combination with performing a function satisfying the condition that, "if an item already exists in the same dropped position, for attaching the dropped item onto an end of the existing item and recognizing both the dropped item and the existing item as information belonging to the same group", as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Amended independent claims 13 and 24 similarly patentably distinguish from the prior art of record. More specifically, amended claim 13 recites "means for inserting a dropped item in a position within the image displaying area if an item from the item displaying area does not already exist in the same dropped position and, if an item already exists in the same dropped position, for appending the dropped item onto

an end of the existing item and recognizing both the dropped item and the existing item as belonging to the same group". Amended independent claim 24 recites "means for inserting a dropped item in a desired position within the image displaying area if an item from the item displaying area does not already exist in the same dropped position and, if an item already exists in the same dropped position, for attaching the dropped item onto an end of the existing item and recognizing both the dropped item and the existing item as information belonging to the same group". No corresponding functions and conditions are disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record as set forth above for amended independent claim 1.

Claims 3-8, 11-12, 21 and 14-18, 22, 23 and 26 depend on and contain all of the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 13 and 24, respectively, and, therefore, distinguish from the prior art of record at least in the same manner as independent claims 1, 13 and 24.

FORMAL INTERVIEW REQUEST

Should the present response not lead to allowance of the application, applicant's undersigned representative hereby requests a telephonic interview with the Examiner, prior to the issuance of a new Office Action, to address the prior art rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 11-18, 21-24 and 26 raised in the May 2, 2008 Office Action. The Examiner is requested to call

applicant's undersigned representative at 212-809-3700 to schedule the telephonic interview in sufficient time for the interview to be conducted prior to the Examiner issuing a new Office Action. Applicant's representative intends for the remarks included herein and the remarks included in the August 4, 2008 response to serve as an interview outline for the interview to be scheduled.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and passage of the application to issue are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ADAMS & WILKS
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Bruce L. Adams
Reg. No. 25,386

17 Battery Place
Suite 1231
New York, NY 10004
(212) 809-3700